

Montague Park Rehabilitation Project

RFP Questions & Answers

1. Is it possible for our firm to team with someone who was able to attend the pre-proposal meeting even if our firm did not attend?

A1. In conformance with our purchasing code, the Parks & Recreation Department is conducting a request for proposal (RFP) process for outreach, design and engineering, project management services for the Montague Park Rehabilitation Project. The Department also has a pre-qualified list of firms from a previous RFP as posted on the City's website. According to City of Santa Clara Purchasing Code Section 2.105.330, contracts for general services are awarded on the basis of "the most advantageous proposal to the City." In determining the most advantageous proposal, a multi-dimensional/professional review of the proposals submitted will be completed and consider the following factors, among others: cost to the City; quality of the proposal; capabilities and expertise of the service provider(s') team(s); and, adherence to applicable City policies and directives. Communication and understanding the City, its community needs, and how to best address them will be critical.

The RFP clearly states that the RFP does not commit the City to enter into a contract, nor does it obligate the City to pay for any costs incurred in preparation and submission of proposals or in anticipation of a contract. In addition, the City reserves the right to:

- Make the selection based on its sole discretion;
- Reject any and all proposals;
- Issue subsequent Requests for Proposals;
- Postpone opening proposals for its own convenience;
- Remedy errors in the Request for Proposals process;
- Approve or disapprove the use of particular sub-consultants;
- Negotiate with any, all or none of the Proposers;
- Accept other than the lowest offer;
- Waive informalities and irregularities in the Proposals; and/or
- Enter into an agreement with another Proposer in the event the originally selected Proposer defaults or fails to execute an agreement with the City.

Proposals from firms and/or teams of firms with a lead proposer are due by the deadline. After an individual and comparative review of all proposals, the selection panel may decide to select a firm or firms with the most advantageous proposal, and if needed, request a presentation to a review panel.

2. On page 10 of the RFQ, there is a notation that "a list of pre-qualified firms has been previously established and is on the City website," Is this RFQ limited to only prequalified firms?

A2. No, this RFQ is not limited to prequalified firms; see response to Q1.

3. Does firm have to go off the pre- qualified list to assemble their team?

A3. No. Proposer can assemble the best team possible to meet the needs of the City including the public input process and delivery of the best project possible. The team

qualifications will be evaluated during proposal review; see response to Q1.

4. Does the lead need to be a Landscape Architect?

A4. No. Proposer can assemble to best team possible to deliver a great project. The team will be evaluated on their qualifications when reviewing the proposal; see response to Q1.

5. Does the City have an expectation of who would prime this Project (either a Landscape Architect or a Civil Engineer)?

A5. No, however it should be clear that there are more qualifications expected to be met than just an LA or CE; see response to Q1.

6. Will the current initial design concepts A, B, and C be made available for review by potential bidders as these are noted as the basis for the start of future community outreach and project design?

A6. Yes. Please see attached at end of this document.

7. Is the current design consultant LPA, Inc. allowed to submit a proposal on this portion of the project work?

A7. Yes. The current Project scope for Montague Park Rehabilitation is different than that originally assigned to LPA. The earlier Project looked at Montague Park for the potential to include athletic and soccer facilities among other existing park sites. The athletic fields are ultimately to be located at a site on Reed & Grant Streets. See response to Q1.

8. What are the building rehabilitation expectations?

A8: Expectations will come forward from the public input process, the Parks and Recreation Commission recommendation, and Council approval/direction on the preferred schematic and final design.

9. What percentage of the proposed budget should be allocated for project management?

A9. There is not a set percentage. The City expects to get to receive a very competitive Proposal that will use as much of the budget as possible for the actual park rehabilitation/construction effort and deliver value from the budgeted amount.

10. On whose property is the baseball field located?

A10. The baseball field is located on Santa Clara Unified School District property, and is not part of the Project scope.

11. Is the pool part of the Project?

A11. The pool is not currently part of the Project scope.

12. Is there a preference for synthetic or natural turf?

A12. Expectations will come forward from the public input process, the Parks and Recreation Commission recommendation, and Council approved direction on the preferred schematic and final design. There may or may not be need for synthetic turf depending upon the place making process.

13. Who determines what goes on City property and what goes on School District property?

A13. The Project scope only includes City of Santa Clara Montague Park property. Santa Clara Unified School District property is not part of the Project scope.

14. What are the current uses of the building?

A14. The Montague Park Building is used as a neighborhood park and recreation facility for SCUSD afterschool programs (program funds come from City among other sources), family and community events, rentals, dance, summer camps, meetings, etc.

15. What neighborhood issues will need to be addressed?

A15. Neighborhood issues may include park uses, street traffic, on/off street parking, noise impacts, access, safety/lighting, vegetation improvements, proposed perimeter pathway, playground design, drainage, sport court, efficient use of space, setbacks, etc.

16. Are there any community or City themes that firms should be made aware?

A16. "Place Making", research/data driven design best practices (including Elements of Play, inclusion, equity, etc.), address the WHO Age Friendly City domains/concepts, Outdoor Fitness, Sustainability in product selection, maintenance and operation.

17. Are translation services required for public input and place making workshops?

A17. No. However, the neighborhood and community need to be fully engaged in the design input process through multiple communication methods, such as in person interaction, on-line survey (Open City Hall), door hangers, Park posters, door to door, social media, etc.

18. Are there restrictions on what can be placed around SVP poles? Are there any joint use agreements or easements of which to be aware?

A18. It will be up to the firm and team selected to research, discover and address all site constraints and issues, i.e. setbacks, easements, Code restrictions and requirements, etc.

19. What are the facility conditions of the buildings?

A19. Montague Park buildings and amenities will be included in a separate Facility Condition Assessment study by Kitchell/CEM to be completed within the next 7 months. The report will be made available to this Project team when complete.

20. What will be the place making process?

A20. The public input and engagement process should include minimally 2-3 Community Meetings, online survey (Open City Hall), focus group meetings with key

stakeholders/neighbors (such as School, user groups, neighbors, etc), 1-2 presentation(s) to the Park & Recreation Commission, 1—2 City Council Meetings. It is up to the Proposer to develop and implement, with City involvement and approval, a comprehensive/robust outreach and inclusionary process, setting appropriate limits on design options due to site constraints, budget, or other rational constraints.

21. Does the Public Works Department manage the project bidding process? During construction, who represents the City at the weekly site meetings? Does the City manage the construction phase with an on-staff construction manager?

A21. The City Public Works Department is the Project Manager (will assign an engineer) and manages the Public Works procurement and bid process.

22. Are there as many as 17 departments involved in the Project Clearance Committee? Do they only review the Schematic Design phase of the work (per Attachment A of the RFP)?

A22. The Project Clearance Committee is comprised of members from all City Departments as needed, and coordinated by the Community Development Department Planning Division; PCC will review the Project application plan set and specifications. Off line meetings with appropriate departments will be expected to resolve any particular issues such as utilities. The construction permit set will be further reviewed by Building Inspection, and the Public Works Department.

23. In the last paragraph of page 10 in the RFP, there is a list of potential deliverables or tasks including “reports”. Does the City anticipate the need for a project report as a deliverable for the Schematic Design phase of the work?

A23. There may be the need for an organized summary report of the community input and design constraints, any options, phasing, cost estimates of various facilities and amenities, etc., as part of the Council report to approve the final schematic design.

24. Submittal of Construction Plans for permits - Does the City have one, central point for plan submittals, which are then internally distributed? Or is the consultant responsible for making multiple submittals to various City departments for review and permits?

A24. There will be a single point for plan submittal where multiple copies will be required.

25. The City has budgeted \$2,875,000 for Montague Park Building replacement and parking, as well as \$315,000 for Montague Park playground. Is that total of \$3,190,000 now allocated to the park in general for park improvements that arise from the master planning process? Based on the estimated or projected building cost, it appears that the master plan will likely lead to phased construction improvements. Is that the City’s expectation?

A25. The input and design process should come up with its own set of community, Commission and Council prioritized improvements and cost estimate for approval with add/alternates/phasing or other method for delivering the final schematic design to be approved. The budget allocated is a total Project CIP allocation as of the RFP date.

26. CEQA Process/Document is not listed in the RFP scope of work from what I can tell, but was referenced at the pre-proposal meeting. Since it is not known yet what program elements the community may ask for, should the proposal exclude a CEQA document, or assume an MND and include a task and fee for CEQA?

26A. The City has a list of pre-qualified environmental planning firms that can provide services as required under CEQA, if required. Project team support for any required additional information, time, and coordination to produce CEQA information is an assumed Project task.

27. Soft costs for the Project including permit fees were projected by the City to be in the range of 25-35% of construction. Can you clarify whether or not that is the correct figure and do those City fees get deducted from the \$3,190,000 stated funding?

27A. Proposers should use their experience, Project understanding and due diligence to provide a best estimate of Project related costs and schedule. The total CIP Project budget allocated is \$3.19M as of the date of the RFP and includes construction and soft costs.

28. Chapter 4 of the required proposal material (page 6 of the RFP) asks for a project understanding, detailed project approach and methodology as well as a description of itemized scope of work and deliverables. Can you verify that the maximum pages allowed for this section is (3)? This is the same number of pages as allowed for the Project Schedule, which will likely be (1) page.

28A. Proposers should comply with the page limits. Schedules should be both detailed and legible to enable a proper review. Schedules too small to be read are not to the Proposer's benefit.

30. We reviewed the Project background (including City directives; sources of parks funds; current Place making actions and meetings; preliminary park plan alternatives; public / community feedback from 2015; and, Council meeting minutes from October 11, 2016). Is there one or more key aspects of Council meeting notes that should be given special attention? Are there any "Links" to helpful information?

30A.

- Place Making: http://www.pps.org/reference/what_is_placemaking/
- Play Value: <http://www.playcore.com/play-value.html>
- Outdoor Fitness: <http://www.athleticbusiness.com/outdoor/what-to-consider-when-adding-outdoor-fitness-to-a-park.html>
- Age Friendly Cities: <http://www.agefriendlysiliconvalley.org/>
- Age Friendly Parks: http://www.pcaagefriendly.org/Files/age-friendly_Checklist-June_2011.pdf
- Sustainable Parks: <http://meetingoftheminds.org/sustainable-parks-work-10514>
- City Developmental Review Process: <http://santaclaraca.gov/government/departments/community-development/planning-division/development-review>
- California Park & Recreation Park Finder: https://www.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=26166

- City of Santa Clara Parks & Recreation Design Standards for Park Amenities: SantaClaraCa.gov, see Park Impact Fee Page.

31. See response to Q1 in addition to the information provided below.

Pre-Proposal Meeting

Firm

Callander & Associates
Lai & Associates
Sandis
LPA
Verde Design
Verde Design
RRM Design Group
RRM Design Group
Dillingham Associates

Contact

Brian Fletcher
Steve Tsang
Tracy Allen
Arash Izadi
Mark Baginski
Tiffan Rayhuck
Jeff Ferber
Jim Wolfe
Paul Dillingham

Email

bfletcher@callanderassociates.com
stsang.lai@gmail.com
tallen@sandis.net
aizadi@lpainc.com
mark@verdedesigninc.com
tiffany@verdedesigninc.com
jferber@rrmdesign.com
jwwolfe@rrmdesign.com
paul@dillinghamlandarch.com

Pre-Qualified List

Firm

Callander Associates
Dahlin Group
Dillingham Architects
Gates + Associates
Group 4
LPA
RRM Design Group
Siegfried Engineering
SSA Landscape Architects
Verde Design
ENGEO Design Engineering
Geosphere Consultants, Inc.
Griffin Structures, Inc.
HMH Engineers
Marcy Wong & Donn Logan Architects
RHAA Landscape Architecture + Planning
Sandis
Ninyo & Moore Geotechnical and
Environmental Sciences Consultants
KPFF

Contact

Brian Fletcher
Gregor Markel, AIA
Reed Dillingham
Linda Gates
Dawn Merkes
Arash Izadi
Jeff Ferber
Paul Schneider, P.E.
Steven R.Sutherland, ASLA
Mark Baginski, RLA
Andrew Firmin
Eric Swenson
Roger Torriero
William Sowa, RLA
Marcy Wong
Manuela King, ASLA
Chad Browning, PE
Terence Wang

Blake Dilsworth, SE

Email

bfletcher@callanderassociates.com
gregor.markel@dahlingroup.com
reed@dillinghamlandarch.com
linda@dgates.com
kjohnson@g4arch.com
aizadi@lpainc.com
jcferber@rrmdesign.com
pjs@siegfriedeng.com
steve@ssala.com
mark@verdedesigninc.com
afirmin@engeo.com
eswenson@geosphereinc.net
rtorriero@griffinholdings.net
bsowa@hnhca.com
marcy@wonglogan.com
manuela@rhaa.com
cbrowning@sandis.net
twang@ninyoandmoore.com

blake.dilsworth@kpff.com

Preliminary design concept A, for discussion purposes only.



Preliminary design concept B, for discussion purposes only.



CONCEPT RENOVATION AND REORGANIZATION OF THE PARK

- POTENTIAL RELOCATED COMMUNITY BUILDING WITH EXPANDED PROGRAM
- RELOCATE RESTROOMS
- CREATE LOOP TRAIL - 1/3 MILE LENGTH
- ADD PATHWAY LIGHTING
- RENOVATE AND UPGRADE PLAYGROUNDS
- RENOVATE FENCING
- PRODUCE PARKING LOT WITH ACCESSIBLE STALLS
- ADD TREES FOR SHADE
- RENOVATE TENNIS COURTS
- REGRASS AND EXPAND CENTRAL LAWN AREA FOR MULTIPURPOSE USE
- ENHANCE LANDSCAPE BUFFER AT PROPERTY LINE

PRELIMINARY CONCEPT FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

LEGEND

- PLAY AREAS
- SPORT COURTS
- PATHWAYS
- COMMUNITY BUILDING
- PARKING
- MULTI-USE FIELD
- D.G. AREA - SKINNED INFILL
- PICNIC AREAS
- DECIDUOUS TREE
- CONIFER TREE
- LOOP TRAIL
- EXISTING

COMMUNITY BUILDING PROGRAM: 7,500 S.F.

- CONCESSIONS AREA
- OFFICE
- RESTROOMS ACCESSIBLE TO PARK AND BUILDING
- STORAGE

CONCEPT RENOVATION AND REORGANIZATION OF THE PARK

- POTENTIAL RELOCATED COMMUNITY BUILDING WITH EXPANDED PROGRAM
- RELOCATE RESTROOMS
- CREATE LOOP TRAIL - 1/3 MILE LENGTH
- ADD PATHWAY LIGHTING
- RENOVATE AND UPGRADE PLAYGROUNDS
- RENOVATE FENCING
- PRODUCE PARKING LOT WITH ACCESSIBLE STALLS
- ADD TREES FOR SHADE
- RENOVATE TENNIS COURTS
- REGRASS AND EXPAND CENTRAL LAWN AREA FOR MULTIPURPOSE USE
- ENHANCE LANDSCAPE BUFFER AT PROPERTY LINE

PRELIMINARY CONCEPT FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY